

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

IN RE CATHODE RAY TUBE (CRT)
ANTITRUST LITIGATION

Master File No. 3:07-md-05944-SC

MDL No. 1917

This Document Relates To:

Tech Data Corp., et al. v. Hitachi, Ltd., et al., No.13-cv-00157;

Siegel v. Technicolor SA, et al., No.13-cv-05261;

Sears, Roebuck and Co., et al. v. Technicolor SA, No. 13-cv-05262;

Best Buy Co., Inc., et al. v. Technicolor SA, et al., No. 13-cv-05264;

Schultze Agency Services, LLC v. Technicolor SA, Ltd., et al., No. 13-cv-05668;

Costco Wholesale Corporation v. Technicolor SA, et al., No. 13-cv-05723;

Electrograph Systems, Inc., et al. v. Technicolor SA, et al., No. 13-cv-05724;

P.C. Richard & Son Long Island Corporation, et al. v. Technicolor SA, et al., No. 13-cv-05725;

Office Depot, Inc. v. Technicolor SA, et al., No. 13-cv-05726;

Interbond Corp. of Am. v. Technicolor SA, et al., No. 13-cv-05727

**[PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING
DIRECT ACTION PLAINTIFFS'
ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION TO SEAL
THEIR OPPOSITION TO MITSUBISHI'S
MOTION FOR PARTIAL SUMMARY
JUDGMENT AS TO DIRECT ACTION
PURCHASERS' SHERMAN ACT
DAMAGES CLAIMS BASED ON CRT
PRODUCT PURCHASES FROM NEC
CORPORATION AND NEC-MITSUBISHI
ELECTRIC VISUAL SYSTEMS
CORPORATION**

On December 23, 2014, the Direct Action Plaintiffs (“DAPs”) filed an Administrative Motion to Seal Portions of their Opposition to Defendants’ Motion for Summary Judgment Based Upon Plaintiffs’ Purported Failure to Distinguish Between Actionable and Non-Actionable Damages Under the FTAIA Pursuant to Civil Local Rules 7-11 and 79-5(d) to file under seal portions of the following documents:

- Direct Action Plaintiffs’ Opposition to Mitsubishi’s Motion for Partial Summary Judgment as to Direct Action Purchasers’ Sherman Act Claims Based On CRT Product Purchases from NEC Corporation and NEC-Mitsubishi Electric Visual Systems Corporation (“Opposition”)
- Exhibits 1-9 to the Declaration of Philip J. Iovieno in Support of the Opposition (“Iovieno Declaration”)

Having read and considered the papers filed and arguments made by counsel, and good cause appearing, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that DAPs’ Administrative Motion to Seal Portions of their Opposition to Mitsubishi’s Motion for Partial Summary Judgment as to Direct Action Purchasers’ Sherman Act Claims Based On CRT Product Purchases from NEC Corporation and NEC-Mitsubishi Electric Visual Systems Corporation Pursuant to Local Civil Rules 7-11 and 79-5(d) is GRANTED.

IT IS SO ORDERED

Dated: _____

Hon. Samuel Conti
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE